

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-71 are pending, Claims 1-21 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claims 22-71 having been added by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action the Abstract was objected to; Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 were rejected as being unpatentable over Dai (U.S. Patent No. 5,847,514); Claims 2-5 and 7-9 were rejected as being obvious over Dai in view of Ford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,089, hereinafter Ford); Claims 10-17 and 19-21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Dai in view of Ford; and Claims 6 and 18 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the identification of allowable subject matter.

In reply, a new Abstract is filed herewith.

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, each of the pending claims have been canceled, and new Claims 22-71 have been added, consistent with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. No new matter is added.

The arguments made in the outstanding Office Action will now be addressed with regard to pending Claims 22-71. Claim 22 is directed to an air cleaning device and generally includes the features of Claim 2, but also includes a recess in the bulb shaped casing. An advantage of having the recess serving as an outlet, is that according to this configuration it is possible to intercept particles, between the inside and outside of the casing. This interception prevents contaminants from entering the casing and also provides a waterproof structure.

In contrast to the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that neither Dai, nor Ford, teach or suggest this feature. The recess is absent in both of the references and therefore the advantages offered by the recess are absent from the asserted prior art. Because

Claims 23-29 depend from Claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Claim 34 is directed to an air cleaning device, that includes the features of original Claims 10 and 13. In this air cleaning device, the ozone generator is provided with a first electrode and a second electrode. Silent corona discharge is induced between the distal end of the needle first electrode and the edge of the plate-like or cylindrical second electrode (or the opening edge) to prevent negative ions and ozone, and to allow the generated negative ions and ozone to pass through the outlet by way of the Coulomb force of the charged atmosphere forward of the first electrode. As neither the claimed structures nor functions are taught or suggested by Dai or Ford, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claim 34 patentably defines over the asserted prior art.

Independent Claim 39 is directed to a combination of original Claims 11 and 13; Claim 40 is directed to a combination of original Claims 10 and 14; Claim 41 is directed to a combination of Claims 11 and 14. It is respectfully submitted that each of these independent Claims 39-41 patentably define over the asserted prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regard to Claim 34.

Claim 42 includes a combination of the features of original Claims 1 and 6. As Claim 6 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter it is respectfully submitted that Claim 42 is also in condition for allowance. Similarly, Claim 43 is directed to a combination of original Claims 2 and 6, and therefore is believed to include allowable subject matter. Claims 44 and 45 are directed to a combination of original Claims (10, 18), and (11, 18), respectively. Claim 18 was indicated in the outstanding Office Action as containing allowable subject matter and so Claims 44-45 are also believed to define over the asserted prior art. Each of Claims 46-71 are dependent claims that depend from one of the above-

discussed independent claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that each of the Claims 46-71, also patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 22-71 is definite and patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

maier
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073